

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

CHARTIS SPECIALTY INSURANCE
COMPANY,

No. C 11-05696 RS

Plaintiff,

SCHEDULING ORDER

v.

TELEGRAPH HILL PROPERTIES, INC.
and W.B. COYLE,

Defendants.

CHARTIS SPECIALTY INSURANCE
COMPANY,

No. C 12-02935 RS

Plaintiff,

v.

THP-SF, INC. and DOES 1-30,

Defendants.

The Court is in receipt of Plaintiff Chartis Specialty Insurance Company's motion, styled as an "unopposed motion for order to change times (setting briefing schedule for dispositive motions and adjusting pre-trial calendar)." The motion is construed as a motion requesting an extension of

1 the current deadline for filing dispositive motions in the two above-captioned cases. The request is
2 granted; dispositive motions must be noticed for hearing no later than Thursday, April 25, 2013.
3 The further case management conference scheduled for March 28, 2013, is continued to June 6,
4 2013 at 10:00 a.m. in courtroom three of the above-captioned court.

5 The proposed order submitted with the motion contains the language “[n]on-expert
6 discovery must be completed by March 8, 2013.” The existing case management scheduling order
7 in these cases, dated August 9, 2012, set the close of non-expert discovery on November 30, 2012.
8 Non-expert discovery has been closed for nearly two months. No good cause has been shown in
9 Plaintiff’s motion as to why non-expert discovery should re-open. The request is therefore denied.
10 *See* Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 16(b)(4). The request for a deadline for the filing of pre-trial motions is also
11 denied as premature.

12 In addition, plaintiff’s earlier-filed “motion to consolidate cases and set briefing schedule” is
13 terminated as improperly noticed. Should plaintiff chose to bring a new motion to consolidate these
14 cases, it must do so in accordance with Civil Local Rule 7-2.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16
17 Dated: 1/24/13

18 
19 RICHARD SEEBORG
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28